UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/689,712	10/22/2003	Howard E. Rhodes	M4065.0660/P660	4640
45374 7590 08/23/2007 DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP			EXAMINER	
1825 EYE STR			JACKSON JR, JEROME	
WASHINGTON, DC 20006	N, DC 20006		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2815	
•		•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		$\mathcal{O}\mathcal{H}$			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Assistant Community	10/689,712	RHODES ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
7. 46.04.040.00	Jerome Jackson Jr.	2815			
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wit	th the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory peri Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the ma earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re tod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT tute, cause the application to become ABA	CATION. ply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31	<u>May 2007</u> .	·			
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ T	☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under the condition of the cond					
Disposition of Claims					
4)	lrawn from consideration. and 94-109 is/are rejected.	the application.			
Application Papers					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.	•			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a	ccepted or b) objected to b	by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to t	he drawing(s) be held in abeyand	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr	•	• •			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forei a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the p application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a l	ents have been received. ents have been received in Apriority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		ummary (PTO-413)			
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date)/Mail Date formal Patent Application 			

Application/Control Number: 10/689,712

Art Unit: 2815

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/31/07 has been entered.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6,8-14,16-28,54-59,61-67,69-90,94-109 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Nakamura 6,690,423.

Art Unit: 2815

Nakamura figure 14B or 19, for example, shows "implant" regions 52 (first) and 40 (second) where 52 extends toward the channel region. The portions are bounded and the second is below the first. Claim 1 is anticipated or at least obvious over Nakamura depending on the interpretation of "portion", boundary, substantially, etc. Note the recitation of "implant" is considered a label or process of making recitation and does not structurally distinguish the final product over Nakamura regardless of any process claimed or implied. A product by process claim is directed to the product per se, no matter how actually made, In re Hirao, 190 USPQ 15 at 17 (footnote 3). See also In re Brown, 173 USPQ 685; In re Luck 177 USPQ 523; In re Fessman 180 USPQ 324; In re Avery 186 USPQ 161; In re Wertheim 191 USPQ 90; and In re Marosi et al 218 USPQ 289, all of which make it clear that it is the patentability of the final product per se which must be determined in a "product by process claim, and not the patentability of the process, and that an old product produced by a new method is not patentable as a product, whether claimed in "product by process claims or not. Note that applicant has the burden of proof in such cases, as the above caselaw makes clear.

Likewise claims reciting donor implant energies or implant angles, etc. are considered process recitations and do not structurally distinguish the final product over Nakamura. Recitations of one donor concentration being less than the other is not considered patentable as there is no magnitude claimed and slight deviations of concentrations are expected in Nakamura for real devices. Note also 52 overlaps 40 and therefore can have a greater concentration.

Portions of 40, 50, 52, 66 or 84 of the several figures can be arbitrarily labeled into first, second, third, fourth, etc. layers and meet the claim recitations. The claims are broad and do not structurally distinguish over Nakamura, of record. In the alternative, claims reciting multiple layers or regions are considered obvious because Nakamura has shown the general structure of providing an extension layer or region to provide the same function. Additional layers are considered at least obvious as "additional" regions or layers in Nakamura can be arbitrarily designated as parts of a larger structure as 40, 52, etc. Moreover, because the inventive extension structure is shown by Nakamura, additional layers, absent unexpected results, are considered obvious over Nakamura.

Recitations of processors, 3T, 4T, etc. are not considered patentable as these structures are fundamental in the art and thus obvious to practice with Nakamura. There are no unobvious patentable 3T, 4T, etc structure claimed or disclosed.

Applicant's arguments with respect to all of the claims have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jerome Jackson Jr. whose telephone number is 571-272-1730. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ken Parker can be reached on 571-272-2298. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2815

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

jj

JEROME JACKSON PRIMARY EXAMINER